

Senate—and the friends of the President say that he is anxious for Clay's Bank bill to pass, that he may put a veto on it—What say you? Timepiece and TYLER TOOK: Respectfully,  
S. L. HAYS.

We shall publish the Address of Wm. W. Irons to his Constituents of Allegheny county, Pennsylvania, a Whig member. He assigns the reasons why he did not vote for Mr. Clay's compromise Bank Bill. His criticism is scorching. Among other reasons, he considers the bill as "insulting to the sovereignty of the States, and to the People of the States," "adverting to the territorial provisions of the clause, you know that, would it recognize the property, or policy, or revenue, or, or, or, call it what you may, of obtaining the assent of the States to the establishment of branches within their borders, it imposes degrading terms and restrictions as to the mode and time of assent, which should be given. It denies the right to presume the assent of the States from the silence of its Legislature—from the dissent of its Legislature—against the dissent of its Legislature, unless that dissent should be unconditional from the veto of a State Executive, in case both Houses of the Legislature should declare its solemn determination to permit the establishment of branches of the Bank, in territory, and against the veto of a

Executive, in case the legislative body should assent. And who are to pronounce on this question of assent or dissent? Who are to decide what shall be considered the "unconditional assent or dissent" to the establishment of branches? Not the State Courts, nor the United States Courts; nor Congress, nor the President nor any Department of the Federal Government, nor the Executive, nor any of the constituted authorities of the States. What tribunal, then, is to judge, decide and pronounce upon this question? Will it be believed that the directors of this banking corporation, residing in the city of Washington, constitute the tribunal which is to sit in judgment on an act of the Legislature of a sovereign State? So says the bill! There it stands recorded."

*We ask for Information!*

The "Madisonian" furnishes some very curious reminiscences upon the Veto power and the Bank question. It appears, that when the first Bank bill was

passed by Congress, it was submitted to President Washington for his signature on the 14th February, 1791; and that on the 20th, being the 6th day of its presentation. On the 23rd February General W. consulted Mr. Hamilton, (Secretary of the Treasury) on this point : "In what precise periodical interpretation of the Constitution, can the President retain it in his possession, before it becomes the law by the lapse of ten days ? Mr. Hamilton gave no opinion, either way ; he said ten days were all that remained, till the bill was delivered to you, and Sunday hence, in the present case, if it is returned on Friday at any time while Congress are sitting, it will hold time. It is well known that General Washington entertained great doubts upon the constitutionality of the Bank bill. He consulted Messrs. Cato and Randolph, who wrote—Messrs. Jefferson and Mc., for it is well known, that Mr. Madison rose against the Bill ; and recalled to the President's recollection the fact, that the power to grant immunities had been there in the Federal compact, &c. rejected. But there is still one circumstance stated by him, which I cannot so well or generally know as upon which, we request information :

1. "The President (Washington) had great difficulties in regard to it, and a veto message was actually prepared by Mr. Madison, by request, and is now retained."

2. "The bill to reward the casting vote of George Clinton," which was introduced by the Senate by Mr. McKim, and which was referred to the Senate by Mr. McKim, was prepared, it is said, by a distinguished member of the present Senate, who took a prominent part against the bill on the dates at that time. Mr. Clinton had a large influence in the Government at that time, and it is probable that the Government is not to be strengthened by an assumption of doubtful powers, but by a wise and energetic execution of those which are incontestable."

If the Veto Message prepared by Mr. Madison, *Senator*, we respectfully suggest, we may have published, would not be a fair statement of the circumstances of the case, it would shed much light on the history of public opinion at that important era, and on this most important question.

We also ask for the name of the Senator, to whom attributed the authorship of old George Clinton's celebrated *casting Speech*. We had always been told that this illustrious veteran was the author of his own address—but if he be not, we should desire to know him, to whom the honor of its production is due. If the author who he may, it is a paper, though short, of great merit—and, as we have often said, deserves to be read by every citizen.

Wrote H. W. Washington. We remember, as it were, yesterday, how the casting vote of George Clinton's Address thrilled through every fibre of our frame like "the sound of the trumpet."

"VIRGINIA ABSTRACTIONS."

We are still happy to see the "Old Dominion" hanging up her proud head in support of her ancient principles. The vote in the House of Representatives against the Bank was 13-12. It was a tie. The names were: Messrs. Bartles, Bots, Gorgin, Powell, Farni, Samers, Talafiero—7. (This last member, the chief of the Federal members, has turned tail upon all the Republican opinions. Once he boasted of being States' Rights' man; ay, like Cost Johnson, a "States' Rights' man—and where is he now? Federalist, up to the hilt, he, the fallow of Federalism, Federalist. But there he is to the eyes and nose, he is just up to the mask.

Yays—Messrs. Banks, Cary, Coles, Gilmer, Gas Harris, Hays, Hopkins, Hubbard, Hunter, John W.

Jones, Mallory, Steenrod, and Wise—14.

THE SUSPENSE.

We understand, the most intense excitement prevails at Washington, as it does *here*. In this country every eye is fixed upon the Metropolis. The case attended every night by an anxious crowd. In the social circle, the leading question is: Will Mr. Ty veto the Bank Bill?

The die is not yet cast. As far as we are advised Mr. Tyler has not yet signed nor vetoed the Bill. One of our friends writes us on the 10th—"The President will stand by his principles in despite of the powers brought to bear upon him. We expect the veto to-morrow, or next day, at furthest."

Another writes on the same day—"I consider the almost certain. If he recommends any expedition may be a Bank in the District, without branches, without the privilege of any circulation except in the form of certificates of deposit, and dealing in exchange on the principles of the old Bank of Amsterdam. — thinks he will make no specific recommendation. It is said, that every effort has been made to seduce or intimidate Mr. Twyer. A letter from a Whig, Mr.

her is said to have been received here, stating that Cabinet had met, and declared their intention to resign unless Mr. Tyler signed the bill—and that he wished veto it, but was afraid. *Nous errons*, (in plain English, *we shall see*.) What! does his Cabinet, and a Cabinet too, dare to threaten him, that unless he commits perjury upon his soul, they will resign? We let them! Do they expect the People will put sackcloth and ashes for them? Verily, we should like to see them try the experiment. Webster, from

Yesterday's Richmond Whig contains a long letter from Washington, of the 10th inst. It begins red in gloomy colours; but clears off towards the last, and predicts that Mr. Tyler "will NOT veto the Bill." These anticipations be not realized, then the writer signs his functions as a Prophet. The writer says, however, if this bill should not succeed, "you

rest assured of one thing—you will have no other Bill  
Mark that! No other Bank bill will be passed. Con-  
gress will consider that it has discharged its duty, and  
the President must take upon himself the whole res-  
ponsibility!"

---

☐ The interesting Debate in the Senate of the  
S. on the *Cumberland Resolutions* is in type, but not  
voidably crowded out to-day. It will appear in To-  
day. Mr. Calhoun's Speech is as able as it is

ALABAMA.—The Election for Governor and Legislature took place on Monday, the 2d instant. The Charleston Mercury infers, "from the first inklings"

the result, that it is likely to end in a mere expedient defeat of the Whigs than any they have yet experienced. We have beaten the Whigs in their own Mobile! We return home not yet reached us, but the Democratic Senator, R. C. Toulin, is elected in Mobile county by a majority of 50. This is excellent! We give below the vote for Governor in several counties.

	Fitzpatrick, (D.)	McClung, (W.)
Montgomery Co.	716	75
Bullock	937	58

Butler,	708	185
Cooze,		187
Autauga,	668	367

Steele and Morgan, the Democratic candidates, elected by a handsome majority. *Well dead, Autauga*  
The Whigs elected a member in this county last year  
owing to a division in the other party.

The Mobile Journal of the 4th gives the return for  
Mobile, as far as heard from. "It is complete with  
exception of the vote at George's precinct. The re-

is, that the Democratic ticket has a majority of about 24, which is not more than usual. Without precinct, Gen. Toulin (Dem.) has a majority of votes over Gen. Joseph Bates (Whig), and John Hogan (Dem.) is elected in place of G. C. Lang (Whig). The reputed majority at George's also is Blanton M'Alpin (Dem.) over Thomas M. C. (Whig). The probability is, that the election has resulted in the choice of a Democratic Senator, two Democratic Representatives, and one Whig Representative.

Whigs. Fitzpatrick's majority about 90. — Dallas county, McClung 257, Fitzpatrick 73.

**KENTUCKY.** — The election continues three days in Kentucky. At the close of the second day in

...rille, the yote stood. Bullock (W.) 950, W.